



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/903,506

07/13/2001

Mark P. Vasudevan

P0272844

1766

35602

7590

01/30/2004

STEPHEN C. GLAZIER
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
1800 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,506

Applicant(s)

VASUDEVAN, MARK P.

Examiner

Jean B Fleurantin

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-28,30-55 and 57-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,29 and 56 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-81 remain pending for examination.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 18-23, filed October 30, 2003, with respect to claims 1, 28 and 81 have been fully considered but, have been found persuasive only to the extent that the prior art of record does not specifically teach the limitations "wherein the OLAP cube is assembled dynamically on demand without accessing a multidimensional database of stored retrieved data" However, Bakalash teaches such limitations.

In response to applicant's argument on page 23, that Jones et al. provide for only unidirectional data communication, where only (1), and not (2), is achieved. In other words, technologies such as Jones et al. are read-only, and a user cannot affect the original source databases via the GUI." It is respectfully submitted that Jones discloses a system comprises a graphical user interface which allows the user to specify all of the report content parameters and display the report on a single screen, (see col. 3, lines 24-41).

Applicant(s) is/are interpreting the claim narrow using the specification without considering the broad teachings of reference(s) used in the rejection.

Art Unit: 2172

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation, see MPEP 2111. During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Therefore, the rejection in last Office Action maintains.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-28, 30-55 and 57-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,516,324 issued to Jones et al. ("hereinafter Jones") in view of U.S. Patent 6,434,544 issued to Bakalash et al. ("hereinafter Bakalash").

As per claims 1, 28 and 55, Jones discloses a method executed by a programmable apparatus, receiving with a computer a data retrieval request from a graphical user interface (GUI) on a programmable user display device (thus, in response to requests for access customers, in particular the system comprises a graphical user interface which allows the user to specify all of the report content parameters and display the report on a single screen, see col. 3, lines 29-33);

b. in response to the retrieval request, accessing with a computer a plurality of disparate digital databases and retrieving with a computer requested data from such databases (thus, the user interface also permits service messaging, report generation and retrieval, the user interface is preferably configured as a network browser which also facilitates linking the scanner or the central facility control station to a network such as an intranet or internet, the same user interface may be integrated into scanners of different modalities, thereby further facilitating service requests and the like by operations personnel without requiring the personnel to become reacquainted with diverse interfaces in a facility, see col. 2, lines 37-46),

assembling with a computer an OLAP cube of the retrieved data (thus, the contents of the table include the following mdxqueryname the name of an mdx procedure used to retrieve report data, , (see col. 9, lines 31-34), and

display the OLAP cube to the user using the GUI (thus, a detailed description of the report, in which the title of the report that is to be displayed on the screens, see col. 9, lines 48-52). Jones does not explicitly disclose wherein the OLAP cube is assembled dynamically on demand without accessing a multidimensional database of stored retrieved data. However, Bakalash discloses the restricting dependency of aggregation from the analytical functions of OLAP and by applying novel and independent algorithms, the stand alone data aggregation server enables efficient organization and handling of data, fast aggregation processing and fast access to and retrieval of any data element in the MDDB, (see 13, lines 38-43), and column 8, line 64 to column 9, line 4. It would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Jones with Bakalash wherein the OLAP cube is assembled dynamically on demand without accessing a multidimensional database of stored retrieved data.

Art Unit: 2172

Such modification would allow the teachings of Jones and Bakalash to provide an improved method of and system for managing data elements within a MDDB during on-line analytic processing (OLAP) operations, (see col. 1, lines 20-22).

As per claims 3, 30 and 57, Jones discloses, a method further comprising removing one database from the plurality of databases (thus, this customer profiling and service contract information can be automatically and periodically extracted from a central service contract database and compared by the operation server 22 to a table of customer profiling and contract information in a local database maintained by the operation server 22, see col. 5, lines 46-51).

As per claims 4, 31 and 58, Jones discloses, a method further comprising adding one database to the plurality of databases (thus, after the central facility has collected and processed the log files of operational data from the scanners, scanner utilization reports can be generated, see cols. 2-3, lines 66-2).

As per claims 5, 32 and 59, Jones discloses, a method further comprising providing a plurality of access codes, each access code corresponding to a number of databases that may be accessed with the access code (thus, the customer must upload a user id and password or access code, see col. 6, lines 39-49),

b. assigning each user an access code, (see col. 6, lines 42-44),

c. receiving and responding to a data access request only if the request is from a user with code authorizing access to all the databases with the requested data, (see col. 6, lines 36-40).

As per claims 6, 33 and 60, in addition to claim 5, Jones further discloses updating data based on a data update request only if the request is from a user with code authorizing update to all the databases with the requested data, (see col. 6, lines 39-49).

As per claims 7, 34 and 61, the limitations of claims 7, 34 and 61 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 8, 35 and 62, Jones discloses, where the plurality of databases are local to the server and directly accessed by the server, (cols. 1-2, lines 64-6).

As per claims 9, 36 and 63, Jones discloses, where the plurality of databases are resident remotely from the server and are accessed each through a remote database server with a native information system, (cols. 1-2, lines 64-29).

As per claims 10, 37 and 64, Jones discloses, where the databases includes SQL databases, relational databases, object oriented databases, multi-dimensional databases and flat databases (thus, the logic is similar for charts except that the chart drop-down SQL must do an additional table join with the ScanPathCharts database table, see col. 8, lines 53-55).

As per claims 11, 38 and 65, Jones discloses, where the plurality of databases are incompatible to each other, (see col. 8, lines 63-67).

As per claims 12, 39 and 66, the limitations of claims 12, 39 and 66 are rejected in the analysis of claim 4, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 13, 40 and 67, Jones discloses, where the displaying step renders 3-dimensional visualizations of an entity, (see col. 9, lines 63-65).

As per claims 14, 41 and 68, the limitations of claims 14, 41 and 68 are rejected in the analysis of claim 13, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 15, 42 and 69, Jones discloses, where the databases and 3-dimensional visualizations related to an oil drilling and producing platform, (see col. 9, lines 63-65).

As per claims 16, 43 and 70, Jones discloses, where the databases and 3-dimensional visualizations related to a geographic area, (see col. 9, lines 55-65).

As per claims 17, 44 and 71, the limitations of claims 17, 44 and 71 are rejected in the analysis of claim 16, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 18, 45 and 72, Jones discloses, where the 3-D visualizations provide access to data for a component of the entity by pointing and clicking on the 3-D visualizations of the component, (see col. 9, lines 55-65).

As per claims 19, 46 and 73, Jones discloses, where the databases contain data stored using one data format from the group comprising: photographic records, textual data, annotated engineering drawings, graphical plots and audio and videotaped records, (see col. 3, lines 11-20).

As per claims 20, 47 and 74, Jones discloses, where the databases are connected using one from the group comprising: OLE-DB technology and a native connection method to the databases, (see col. 2, lines 29-37).

As per claims 21, 48 and 75, Jones discloses, where the databases use a network topology that is one from the group comprising: a network topology managed by an operating system, and Internet protocols, (see col. 2, lines 38-42).

As per claims 22, 49 and 76, Jones discloses, where the displaying step increases and decreases data detail based on input from a user (thus, the user specifies the desired report content parameters and then clicks a virtual activation button to display the report in the report area of the screen, each of the report content parameter options displays a dynamic list containing the most recent data in the database, see col. 3, lines 42-445).

As per claims 23, 50 and 77, the limitations of claims 23, 50 and 77 are rejected in the analysis of claims 22, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 24, 51 and 78, Jones discloses, where the displaying step displays components of the entity according to a color-coding scheme, (see col. 6, lines 52-54).

As per claims 25, 52 and 79, the limitations of claims 25, 52 and 79 are rejected in the analysis of claim 24, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 26, 53 and 80, Jones discloses, where the retrieved data can be analyzed through tabulated trend analysis and graphical analysis (thus, in response to requests for access from customers, the system comprises a graphical user interface which allows the user to specify all of the report content parameters and display the report on a single screen, see col. 3, lines 20-33).

As per claims 27, 54 and 81, Jones discloses, where data about the plurality of digital databases are stored in at least one serialized file (see cols. 2-3, lines 66-2), said method further comprising assembling a new virtual data warehouse based in part on at least one serialized file (thus, the report produced will contain the information currently in the database, which information is update daily, see col. 3, lines 37-39).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2, 29 and 56 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest in combination with other elements, accepting through the GUI a user update of specific data displayed from the assembled OLAP cube,

accessing a database relevant to the specific data of the user update, and updating that database dynamically on demand with the specific data of the user update, and

dynamically updating the assembled OLAP cube on demand with the specific data update as recited in claim 2.

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest in combination with other elements, accepting through the GUI a user update of specific data displayed from the assembled OLAP cube,

accessing a database relevant to the specific data of the user update, and updating that database dynamically on demand with the specific data of the user update, and

dynamically updating the assembled OLAP cube on demand with the specific data update as recited in claim 29.

The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest in combination with other elements, means to accept through the GUI a dynamic user update of specific data displayed from the assembled OLAP cube,

means to access a constituent database relevant to the specific data of the user update, and updating that database dynamically on demand with the specific data of the user update, and

dynamically updating the assembled OLAP cube on demand with the specific data update as recited in claim 56.

Art Unit: 2172

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2172

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean B Fleurantin whose telephone number is 703-308-6718.


The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BREENE JOHN E can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


Jean Bolte Fleurantin

2004-01-22


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER